

REMARKS

In the Official Action mailed on **12 May 2009**, the Examiner reviewed claims 1-2, 5-22, and 25-40. Examiner rejected claims 1-2, 5-22, and 25-40 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on Maritzen et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,987,429, hereinafter “Maritzen”), and Bross et al. (U.S. Pub. No. 2003/0105687, hereinafter “Bross”).

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Examiner rejected claims 1-40 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on Maritzen and Bross. Applicants respectfully disagree. In the embodiments of the present invention, a tax rules navigator gets a tax rule from a set of tax rules. The tax rule points to a configurable driver template, which includes one or more drivers and points to ***one or more condition groups***. (See Instant Application at ¶¶ [00116], [00119] and [00123]) A configurable driver template is used to group two or more drivers that simultaneously affect the outcome of ***one or more tax computation processes***. (*Id.* at ¶ [00116]) A driver is an attribute of a transaction that acts as an input to a process. (*Id.* at ¶ [00121]) A condition group is a combination of values and conditions associated with the drivers in the configurable driver template. (*Id.* at ¶ [00117]) If all of the conditions in a condition group are satisfied, the appropriate process result is retrieved. If any of the conditions in the condition group is not satisfied, the next available condition group is considered in the order of precedence. If none of the condition groups associated with the tax rule is evaluated successfully, the next tax rule in order of precedence will be examined. (*Id.* at ¶ [00123]).

By contrast, neither Maritzen nor Bross nor their combination discloses the limitations of (1) “*wherein the configuration template identifies one or more condition groups, wherein a condition group is a combination of values and*

conditions associated with the drivers in the configurable template, and wherein the condition group specifies one or more conditions that must be satisfied for the tax computation process to arrive at a result” and (2) “a second tax rule, which specifies a second configurable template for a second tax computation process” as recited in the amended claim 1.

First, although Bross discloses a tax declaration template, Bross specifically discloses that “*[o]ne and the same filing service can be used for different jurisdictions, and the processing steps to be performed by the user are the same for all jurisdictions.*” (See Bross at ¶ [0141]). Therefore, Bross fails to disclose “*a second tax computation process*” because Bross uses the *same* process for all different jurisdictions. Also, the filing service of Bross includes a request verification component, which verifies that certain conditions are fulfilled. (*Id.* at ¶ [0133]). If the result of request verification is positive, the tax filing determination component is activated and fetches report content rules and tax declaration templates. (*Id.* at ¶ [0134]). Therefore, unlike the present invention where condition groups are associated with templates, the set of conditions to be verified in Bross is not specific to any rules or templates.

Second, as Examiner correctly noted in paragraph 8 of the Office Action, Maritzen fails to disclose using configurable template. Thus, Maritzen cannot disclose “*wherein the configuration template identifies one or more condition groups*” and “*a second tax rule, which specifies a second configurable template for a second tax computation process.*”

Furthermore, it is not obvious to combine Maritzen and Bross to obtain the present invention, because the combination of Maritzen and Bross does not disclose the three layers of cascaded decisions in claims 1 and 21 as introduced by (1) “*responsive to each condition in the first group being satisfied,*” (2) “*responsive to any condition in the first condition group not being satisfied,*” and (3) “*responsive to none of the one or more condition groups identified by the*

configurable template is satisfied.” Maritzen at most discloses testing whether the location and the fee rule conditions apply to a transaction, and if so, calculating the fee according to the fee rule. (See Maritzen at Col. 2, lines 15-17). Likewise, Bross merely discloses verifying whether certain conditions are fulfilled, and if so, fetching report content rules. (See Bross at ¶¶ [0133]-[0134]). Therefore, both Maritzen and Bross fail to disclose considering one or more groups of conditions associated with a specific tax rule in the order of precedence.

Accordingly, Applicant has amended independent claims 1 and 21 to render definite the limitations regarding condition groups, tax computation processes, and the cascading decisions described above. These amendments find support in paragraphs [00115]-[00125], as well as Figures 9 and 12, of the instant application. No new matter has been added.

Hence, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 1 and 21 as presently amended are in condition for allowance. Applicant also submits that claims 5-20, which depend upon claim 1 and claims 25-40, which depend upon claim 21, are for the same reasons in condition for allowance and for reasons of the unique combinations recited in such claims.

Correction of Inventorship

Applicants petitioned for correction of inventorship on **14 January 2005** and requested consideration of adding **Paulo Back** to the list of inventors. Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to consider the above-referenced petition.

CONCLUSION

It is submitted that the application is presently in form for allowance.
Such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

By /Shun Yao/
Shun Yao
Registration No. 59,242

Date: 22 July 2009

Shun Yao
Park, Vaughan & Fleming LLP
2820 Fifth Street
Davis, CA 95618-7759
Tel: (530) 759-1667
Fax: (530) 759-1665
Email: shun@parklegal.com